



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a nominal charge, and are available in every library, it might have been well to have omitted them, and to have made a reduction in the price of the book corresponding to the cost of printing the 64 pages of unnecessary text.

The book is provided with a satisfactory index, and contains a valuable bibliography of fifteen pages, dealing chiefly with American, British, French, and German literature on commercial policy in war and peace.

JACOB VINER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*What the Workers Want.* By ARTHUR GLEASON. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Howe, 1920. Pp. 505. \$4.00.

Arthur Gleason is of all American students the one best informed on the recent events and current tendencies of the British Labor Movement. Therefore, though he is not a certified economist, and though he writes in the pleasantest and most informal style of the journalist, American economists cannot afford to neglect his work.

*What the Workers Want* is more definitely to the economist's purpose than the earlier *British Labor and the War*. The bulk of the newer book is given to industrial problems and to the industrial side of the labor movement. 1919 was a trade union year in England. Parliament, as Mr. Gleason points out (pp. 76, 141), was mainly a spectator. The process of government, at least the dramatic visible process, was largely a series of moves and counter-moves by the Prime Minister on the one hand and the leaders of the great trade unions on the other. And in the labor movement itself, "it was in the main the trade unionists who were heading the swing to the left and not the political socialists" (p. 83). Mr. Gleason gives a vivid narrative of such scenes in this drama as the National Industrial Conference, "one of Mr. George's flashing improvisations" (p. 73) at which the Prime Minister "appeared with all the irrelevance of a beautiful woman on a battlefield" (p. 26); the sober debates on "Direct Action" at the Labor Party and Trades Union Congresses; and the Railway Strike in which "the State laid aside its sovereignty and sacred impersonality and became, very simply, two men, Sir Eric Geddes, representing the employing class, and Mr. Lloyd George representing the middle class" (p. 140). Best of all is the account of that great public clinic in economics, the Coal Commission (at which Mr. Gleason was the most persistent spectator). "Fronting each other in an informal but dramatic way are the two systems of financial control (private enterprise and nationalization)

and the two theories of management (autocratic and democratic). . . . No such latitude of questioning has ever before been permitted in an official industrial investigation. Here you had a miner cross-examining a millionaire employer . . . and an owner asking a miner, 'What do you really want?'. . . . Frank Hodges, the miner, said to Harold Cox, the individualist, 'Your philosophy wouldn't count much against the determination of a million men.' . . . Sir Leo Chiozza Money asked the noble Duke (of Northumberland): 'What particular service, as coal owner, do you perform?' 'As owner, no service' " (pp. 33-51). An economic clinic, but hardly an orthodox one. . . . And the skill with which it is reported makes one wish that Mr. Gleason were still in England to untangle for Americans the series of crises in the industry which have followed the shelving of the Commission's report.

The account of the Coal Commission, with its shrewd and playful pictures of the chief actors, is an illustration of what is, to the general reader, both the book's greatest charm and its greatest danger—its emphasis on the personalities of the labor movement. The danger is that of a heroistic reading of current tendencies. No doubt "it is of high political importance that we in America learn to know these men of labor" (p. 109), and Mr. Gleason's appreciations of them are first hand and excellent, especially the study of Robert Smillie and the recognition of the importance of the rise to power of the young workman-economist, Frank Hodges. The reviewer, at least, has no quarrel with Mr. Gleason's taste in heroes. Nor is it necessary to be shocked when he compares Mr. Clynes of the unskilled laborers to Elihu Root; Oxford has made Clynes a D.C.L. And the sketches of Havelock Wilson and the Duke of Northumberland, for example, are done with as much good temper and novelist's skill as those of the radicals whom Mr. Gleason obviously prefers. But this sympathetic handling of personality may, by its very skill, encourage a superstition already widely current among the less intelligent of Mr. Gleason's fellow-radicals—the belief that the main difference between the British and American labor movements is a miraculous outcropping in the one case of inspired leaders. Mr. Gleason, of course, does not share the superstition; he is too good a student of the rank-and-file movements and of "economic power" (p. 80), and is careful not to overstate the applicability of English experience to American problems (p. 4); but a hasty reader may miss the caution and remember only the people.

For this possible danger the book furnishes the careful student its own antidote. The Appendix, which is just half the book, is a collection of documents admirably chosen to illustrate the differences between the

industrial situation in the two countries—of which the differences in labor leaders are a convenient journalistic symbol. The Federation of British Industries, which corresponds quite exactly to the National Industrial Conference Board, is quoted (p. 294) as “recognizing that the theories of the Syndicalists and the Guild Socialists have arisen from a genuine grievance, which demands and should receive some remedy.” British employers and workers, through their chosen representatives in the National Industrial Conference, are quoted as agreeing unanimously on the minimum wage, the forty-eight-hour week, and the “full and frank acceptance of employers’ organizations on the one hand and trade unions on the other, as the recognized organizations to speak and act in behalf of their members.” The Sankey and Foster Reports, which have been more talked about than read, are printed in full. The Appendix is, in fact, an invaluable source book for any serious student of contemporary English affairs. And if the whole book did nothing else but tempt American students of economics, by its account of the Coal Commission and its extracts from the evidence, to turn for themselves to the great mine of material on economic theory and industrial practice contained in the two blue books of testimony (cmd. 359 and 360), it would have been well worth doing.

But Mr. Gleason is not merely a popularizer. Others have quoted and enlarged upon judgment of Sir Richard Redmayne, the government’s chief technical expert, “that the present system of individual ownership of collieries is extravagant and wasteful.” (p. 44). But he is, I think, the first to seize upon the importance of the bearings of the Coal Commission evidence on that cleavage in interest between *capitalists* and *technicians* on which Veblen and Tawney, in their very different manners, have based much of their economic theory. “The royalty owners and coal owners pleaded that rich rewards should go to directive capacity. Then the records were dug up and it was found that a large percentage of colliery managers received £400 a year” (p. 15; see also footnote p. 152). “An owner testified that profits were needed in order to reward good management. ‘I know nothing of these things,’ said Tawney; ‘I supposed that profits were paid to the capital invested. Tell me, do profits go to the manager?’” (p. 36). Equally important is Mr. Gleason’s recognition of the new element which Lord Haldane’s testimony injected into the lifeless discussions of public ownership. The section in the Appendix on “The New Type of Civil Servant” is the one best selected to bear upon a single problem.

The book nowhere gets put together, and Mr. Gleason’s generalizations are likely to come as shrewd asides—like the picture of the “‘private

enterprise' type of young man" emigrating to "some one of the business republics"—or in such chapter headings as "Gentle Revolution." He is good at titles, but the one most suggestive of all is perhaps that of the book itself. Its suggestiveness to economists consists less in what Mr. Gleason has actually done with the subject of *What the Workers Want* (though the statements he has secured from the leaders of the Miners and Shop Stewards and the more guarded of his own comments are of great help in interpreting the new demands of labor) than in the job it sets for economic theorists. For some of the things workers seem to want—and which economic theory must consider if it is to be relevant to modern economic problems—hardly fit the familiar categories of a science which has been mainly concerned with what consumers want of workers (and other factors in production). The title suggests that the conventional problem of "labor from the point of view of production" cannot nowadays be considered apart from the problem of *production from the point of view of labor*—that is, the quality of that part of people's lives which is spent at work. *What the Workers Want* suggests a producer's protest against a consumer's science.

CARTER L. GOODRICH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Principles of Labor Legislation.* (4th edition.) By COMMONS AND ANDREWS. Harper and Bros., 1920 Pp. 536. \$2.75.

This standard work, first published in 1916, has been revised to include the developments since that date. The intervening years have witnessed an extension and improvement of workmen's compensation and minimum wage legislation, federal restrictions upon child labor, the strengthening of the case for health and old-age insurance, and a distinct improvement in the administration of labor laws by the states. All these topics and many others are admirably treated by the authors and the book continues to hold unquestioned superiority in its field.

---

*Labor in Politics or Class versus Country.* By CHARLES NORMAN FAY. Published by the author, 1920, Cambridge, Mass.

This is an attack upon the aims and methods of organized labor by an ex-official of the National Association of Manufacturers. Mr. Fay opposes the formation of national unions and urges that the unit of collective bargaining should be the individual plant and should be confined to an employer and his own employees. This book is excellent in giving the point of view of an able opponent of labor unionism and deserves study by all who wish to understand the psychology and arguments of this class.